

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of December 21, 2006 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,250 to Jong (hereinafter Jong). Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. Applicants also have amended dependent Claim 8 to emphasize certain additional aspects of the invention.

Additionally, Applicants have amended paragraphs [0007] and [0020], as well as the Abstract, to correct minor typographical errors in each. Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for noting these minor typographical errors and suggesting the appropriate corrections needed.

As discussed in the following section, the amendments are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

Aspects Of The Invention

It may be helpful, prior to addressing the cited reference, to emphasize certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, typified by Claim 1, as amended, is a method of voice-to-text reduction for real-time messaging.

The method can include receiving speech input from a calling party and transcribing the speech input to a text message. The method can further include converting the text message to an alternate text message. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0021], lines 6-20; see also FIG. 2, especially elements 25 and 33.) For example, the message "What's going on?" can be converted into the alternative slang

phrase "wass'up?," or the message "it's time to go" can be converted into the alternative, colorful expression "let's bolt." Moreover, according to one embodiment of the invention, the conversion of a text message into an alternate text message can be based upon one or both of a calling party profile and a called party profile. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0021], lines 6-8; see also FIG. 2, especially element 33.)

Additionally, the method can include compressing the alternate text message using data compression techniques. Compression of the text message, more particularly, can be accomplished by performing a data compression so as to compress the text message. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0016], lines 1-5 and 7-9.) Moreover, this step can be performed prior to transmission of the text message, the message being transmitted as a data stream defining a text stream.

The method also can include transmitting the text stream to a called party, and receiving a text message from the called party as a text stream. The method further can include rendering the text stream at the called party and the calling party substantially in real-time.

According to another embodiment of the invention, exemplified by Claims 6 and 7 and amended Claim 8, a method of voice-to-text reduction for real-time messaging can also include the step of translating the text message to another language so as to provide a translated text message. The method can include then transmitting the translated text message. Moreover, the step of translating the text message can be performed in a network server coupled between the calling party and the called party. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0023], lines 1-5; see also FIG. 2.)

The Claims Define Over Jong

As already noted, independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Jong. Jong is directed to an apparatus and method for providing "speech-

text-transmit" communications over a data communication network, such as the Internet. (Col. 1, line 55 – Col. 2, line 19; see also Col. 2, lines 53 – 64.)

Text conversion based upon a user profile

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Jong fails to teach each feature recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19, as amended. For example, Jong does not expressly or inherently teach converting a text message to an alternative text message, in a manner comparable to that provided by Applicants' invention. Jong discloses a language translator, but Jong's language translator merely translates text data from one language to another, such as from English to Japanese. (See Col. 8, line 62 – Col. 9, line 5.) Jong's translation, more fundamentally, is not based upon any type of user profile, either a calling party profile or a called party profile. Indeed, Jong nowhere even suggests the use of any type of user profile, let alone one corresponding to a calling party and/or a called party.

Jong does not teach any profile serves as the basis for converting a text message to an alternative text message, as recited in amended Claims 1, 11, and 19. It follows, therefore, that Jong does not teach converting one text message to an alternate text message based on one or more of a calling party profile and a called party profile, as expressly recited in each of Claims 1, 11, and 19.

Jong is unable to convert, for example, one English expression to a corresponding slang expression – such as converting the expression "it's time to go" into the slang expression "let's bolt" – depending on a particular profile corresponding to the calling party and/or the called party. Jong's standard first-language-to-second-language translations applies in the same way with respect to every party, calling or called. Jong's language translation is in no way user-specific. Jong's standard language translation is not determined based upon either a calling party profile or a called party profile. As

already observed, Jong provides no type of user profile for either a calling party or a called party. Jong's standard first-language-to-second-language conversion has nothing to do with generating an alternate message from an initial message depending on a particular profile or profiles of the calling and/or called party, as expressly recited in amended Claims 1, 11, and 19.

Text data compression

Jong likewise fails to teach the additional feature of compressing a text message before transmitting the message, as further recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19, as amended. Jong stresses the lower data rate of text data packet transmissions as compared to voice telephony data packets transmitted over a data communications network. (See, e.g., Col. 1, line 65 – Col. 2, line 5.) Nowhere, though, does Jong even suggest that further benefits can be achieved by performing data compression on a text message prior to transmission of the text message over the data communication network. Accordingly, Jong likewise fails to teach, expressly or inherently, this feature as recited in amended Claims 1, 11, and 19.

Amended Claim 8

With respect to amended Claim 8, Jong further fails to teach translating a text message to another language prior to transmitting the translated text message, wherein the translation is performed in a network server. Jong discloses converting a text message from one language to another, but Jong relies on a language translator that is part of a "subscriber terminal" that connects to a data communications network; Jong's language translator does not reside in a server coupled *between* two such terminals. (Compare FIGs. 1, 2, and 9.)

Specifically, Jong's language translator is incorporated in a speech recognition device:

"FIG. 9 shows a third embodiment in which the speech recognition device 203 outputs text data in a selected language. In this embodiment, the speech recognition device 203 further receives commands through the user interface 204 indicating the selected language. The speech recognition device 203 further includes a language translator 900. The language translator 900 may be a single device that translates text data in one language to text data in multiple other selected languages or may be separate devices that translate text data between two selected languages (for example, English and Japanese). (Col. 8, line 62 – Col. 9, line 5.) (Emphasis supplied.)

The speech recognition device of Jong, however, is not within a network-connected server. Instead, Jong's speech recognition device (203) is part of a subscriber terminal (100) that connects to a data communications network (150):

"The subscriber terminals 100 and 110 may be personal computers connected to the data network 150 via modem connections, computer terminals connected via a LAN or WAN, WebTV.TM. devices, telephones (wired or wireless) connected to computing gateways with access to the Internet, and the like. For purposes of explanation of the present invention, subscriber terminals 100 and 110 are considered to be personal computers connected to the data network via modem connections.

* * * * *

" FIG. 2 is a block diagram of subscriber terminal 100. The subscriber terminal 110 is similarly equipped. As shown in FIG. 2, the subscriber terminal 100 includes a terminal controller 202, a speech recognition device 203, a user interface 204, a modem 205, a text to speech conversion device 206, an outgoing text buffer 207, a storage device 208 and an incoming text buffer 209. These devices are connected to one another by way of bus 210. The terminal controller 202 controls the flow of information along the bus 210 to each of the devices." (Col. 2, line 65 – Col. 3, line 35.) (Emphasis supplied.)

Nowhere does Jong teach, expressly or inherently, translating a text message to another language prior to transmitting the translated text message, wherein the translation is performed in a network server connected between a calling party and a called party, as recited in amended Claim 8.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Jong fails to teach, expressly or inherently, every feature recited in amended Claims 1, 11, and 19. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 1, 11, and 19 define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that, whereas each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1, 11, or 19 while reciting additional features, each of the dependent claims likewise defines over the prior art.

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if

Appln No. 10/603,495
Amendment dated March 21, 2007
Reply to Office Action of December 21, 2006
Docket No. BOC9-2002-0070 (367)

the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: March 21, 2007

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Richard A. Hinson", is written over a horizontal line.

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000